




The Role of Information Literacy on Cognitive Skills and Individual Factors (Self-Efficacy and Motivation) in the Curriculum of Secondary School Students


Masoumeh. Najafi¹, Soodabeh. Azodolmolky^{2*}, Ashraf Sadat. Hosseini Mir Safi²

¹ PhD Student, Department of Educational Sciences, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran



² Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: s_azedolmalki@azad.ac.ir

Editor

Maryam Fatehizade¹
Professor of Counseling
Department, Faculty of Educational
Sciences and Psychology, Isfahan
University, Iran
m.fatehizade@edu.ui.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Salehi¹
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management, Sari Branch, Islamic
Azad University, Sari, Iran. Email: drsalehi@iausari.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Sadegh Maleki Avarsin¹
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Tabriz Branch, Islamic
Azad University, Tabriz, Iran. Email: s.maleki@iaut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence "In general information is essential for every aspect of life" is overly broad and lacks specificity. It is recommended to provide a more focused statement that directly ties information literacy to the cognitive skills and individual factors discussed in the study.

The use of cluster random sampling is mentioned, but the reason for choosing this particular sampling method over others is not explained. A justification for this choice would be useful for readers to understand the sampling strategy better.

The description of the Information Literacy Questionnaire is somewhat vague, particularly regarding how the items were developed. It would be beneficial to provide more detail about the item development process and the theoretical framework that guided it.

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the Information Literacy Questionnaire is reported as 98%, which seems unusually high. It may be useful to discuss the implications of such a high reliability coefficient, as it could suggest redundancy among items.

The discussion section tends to reiterate the results without offering sufficient interpretation in the context of existing literature. It would be helpful to more deeply explore how these findings contribute to or challenge current understandings in the field.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The review of literature on information literacy mentions various studies but does not sufficiently discuss the gaps in the existing research that your study aims to fill. Including a more critical analysis of these gaps would strengthen the justification for your research.

The term "cognitive style" is introduced but not clearly defined until much later in the article. It would be beneficial to define this term when it is first mentioned to aid reader comprehension.

The study employs a descriptive-correlational design but does not fully explain why this design is appropriate for investigating the relationships between information literacy, cognitive skills, and individual factors. Including a brief rationale would enhance the methodological rigor.

While the validity of the Cognitive Skills Questionnaire is discussed, it would be beneficial to include more specific information about how the factor structure was determined (e.g., exploratory vs. confirmatory factor analysis).

The article mentions the use of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) but does not describe the specific steps taken in the SEM process. Providing more detail on the model specification, estimation method, and goodness-of-fit indices would enhance the transparency of the analysis.

The interpretation of the regression analysis results could be more nuanced. For instance, the article mentions a positive relationship between media literacy components and cognitive skills, but it would be beneficial to discuss the practical significance of this relationship.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.